

the books be issued bound, and on the express condition that they shall be distributed without alteration or addition."

I may state that the Committee, at the period referred to, had justified the circulation of the bible with the Apocrypha on the ground that their agents found difficulty in disposing of the Society's bibles abroad without the Apocryphal books, deeming it more expedient to dispose of the word of God accompanied with the Apocrypha than that its diffusion should be restricted. The Committee were wrong, and the resolutions contain an unequivocal acknowledgment of their error, but every succeeding Committee have been faithful to the pledge given in 1826. To assert or insinuate the contrary is a gross libel. To test the truth of Mr. Munro's charge of a violation of good faith in this matter, Mr. Alex. Russell addressed a letter to the Committee of the National Bible Society of Scotland, of which Messrs. Sutherland and Munro are supporters, wishing information. The Rev. Dr. Goold replied at once, expressing his conviction that there was no ground whatever for the charge. Yet the Revd. accusers of the association, in the face of the declaration referred to, persistently and dishonourably adhere to the accusation. *Nam ego illum periisse duco cui quidem periit pudor.* Do these gentlemen for one moment imagine that the numerous and influential supporters of the Bible Society in Scotland could remain ignorant of so gross an infringement of one of the Society's fundamental rules, or that, on the discovery of bad faith on the part of the Committee, they would fail to denounce them publicly? Is it, moreover, I would ask, at all probable that the people of Scotland should remain ignorant of a fact that seems so patent to Messrs. Sutherland and Munro? One would suppose that the means of obtaining information in Scotland on such points ought to be more accessible than in the distant province of Nova Scotia. At any rate, Messrs. Sutherland and Munro in their pamphlet simply tell the public what they affirm they themselves believe without giving the grounds, in regard to the Apocrypha, on which their belief is founded; and in the absence of these grounds the public must decline to place any reliance on a statement which involves the character of the management of the Bible Society, and which is only supported by the *dictum* of these gentlemen.

As to the Unitarian Bible, the Society never did circulate it, or in any way give it countenance. Were such a proposal mooted, it would be met by universal condemnation. As well might the Society attempt to circulate David Hume's or Robert Owen's infidel productions with impunity. How the slander has originated I know not, but that the Revd. gentlemen should give it currency, without adducing a word of proof, were incredible if not given under their own names.

The Revd. gentlemen refer to versions of the bible in the Italian, French, Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, and German languages; and in dealing with "the character of these versions," they considerably say—"our proposed limits will not allow of being very minute in pointing out the difference between the different Roman versions. *Neither shall we quote in the language of these versions, which would only be a dead letter to the great body whom we address. Such as know the languages can consult the passages referred to for themselves.*" The simple reader will imagine from these remarks that the two Rev. Authors are masters of the six languages named. Mr. Russell tells us that on a certain occasion one of them admitted that he could not even read French; and I have it on good authority, that they are profoundly ignorant of the very tongues in which the versions which they profess to criticise are rendered. Hence any opinion which they hazard as to the accuracy of the translations is worthless. It is to be hoped that the next time these gentlemen venture to challenge the accuracy of any versions of the bible which they are unable to read, they will have the candour to make an acknowledgment to that effect, so that the public may not give them credit for an amount of linguistic knowledge to which they